arXiv:1703.08404v1 [math.AP] 24 Mar 2017

SIGN CHANGING SOLUTIONS OF P-FRACTIONAL EQUATIONS WITH CONCAVE-CONVEX NONLINEARITIES

MOUSOMI BHAKTA, DEBANGANA MUKHERJEE

ABSTRACT. In this article we study the existence of sign changing solution of the following p-fractional problem with concave-critical nonlinearities:

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta)_p^s u &= \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{p_s^*-2}u \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega,\\ u &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,\end{aligned}$$

where $s \in (0,1)$ and $p \geq 2$ are fixed parameters, $0 < q < p-1$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $p_s^* = \frac{Np}{N-ps}$. Ω is an open, bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary with $N > ps$.

1. Introduction

Let us consider the fractional p-Laplace equation with concave-critical nonlinearities

$$(\mathcal{P}_\mu)\begin{cases}(-\Delta)_p^s u = \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{p_s^*-2}u & \text{in} \quad \Omega,\\ u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,\end{cases}$$

where $s \in (0,1)$, $p > 1$ are fixed, $N > ps$, Ω is an open, bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary, $0 < q < p-1$, $p^* = \frac{Np}{N-ps}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The non-local operator $(-\Delta)_p^s$ is defined as follows:

$$(-\Delta)_p^s u(x) = 2\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_\varepsilon(x)} \frac{|u(y)-u(x)|^{p-2}(u(y)-u(x))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dy, \;\; x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.1}$$

For $p \geq 1$, we denote the usual fractional Sobolev space by $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ endowed with the norm

$$||u||_{W^{s,p}(\Omega)} := ||u||_{L^p(\Omega)} + \left(\int_{\Omega\times\Omega} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy\right)^{1/p}.$$

We set $Q := \mathbb{R}^{2N} \setminus (\Omega^c \times \Omega^c)$ with $\Omega^c = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ and define

$$X := \left\{u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable } \Big| u|_\Omega \in L^p(\Omega) \text{ and } \int_Q \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy < \infty\right\}.$$

The space X is endowed with the norm defined as

$$||u||_X = ||u||_{L^p(\Omega)} + \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy\right)^{1/p}.$$

Then, we define $X_0 := \left\{u \in X : u = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\right\}$ or equivalently as $\overline{C_c^\infty(\Omega)}^X$ and for any $p > 1$, X_0 is a uniformly convex Banach space (see [16]) endowed with the norm

$$||u||_{X_0} = \left(\int_Q \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy\right)^{1/p}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47G20, 35J20, 35J60, 35J62.

Key words and phrases. p-fractional, nonlocal, concave-convex, critical, sign-changing, Nehari manifold.

Since $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$, the above integral can be extended to all of $\mathbb{R}^N$. The embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^r(\Omega)$ is continuous for any $r \in [1, p_s^*]$ and compact for $r \in [1, p_s^*)$. For further details on X_0 and it's properties we refer [14].

Definition 1.1. *We say that $u \in X_0$ is a weak solution of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ if*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy &= \mu\int_\Omega |u(x)|^{q-1}u(x)\phi(x)dx \\ &+ \int_\Omega |u(x)|^{p_s^*-2}u(x)\phi(x)dx,\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi \in X_0$.

The Euler-Lagrange energy functional associated to $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}I_\mu(u) &= \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\int_\Omega |u|^{p_s^*}dx \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\|u\|_{X_0}^p - \frac{\mu}{q+1}|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

We define the best fractional critical Sobolev constant S as

$$S := \inf_{v\in W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|v(x)-v(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy}{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |v(x)|^{p_s^*}dx\right)^{p/p_s^*}}, \tag{1.3}$$

which is positive by fractional Sobolev inequality. Since the embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^{p_s^*}$ is not compact, I_μ does not satisfy the Palais-Smale condition globally, but that holds true when the energy level falls inside a suitable range related to S. As it was mentioned in [13], the main difficulty dealing with critical fractional case with $p \neq 2$, is the lack of an explicit formula for minimizers of S which is very often a key tool to handle the estimates leading to the compactness range of I_μ. This difficulty has been tactfully overcome in [13] and [20] by the optimal asymptotic behavior of minimizers, which was recently obtained in [9]. Using the same optimal asymptotic behavior of minimizer of S, we will establish suitable compactness range.

Thanks to the continuous Sobolev embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^{p_s^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, I_μ is well defined C^1 functional on X_0. It is well known that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the weak solutions of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ and the critical points of I_μ on X_0.

A classical topic in nonlinear analysis is the study of existence and multiplicity of solutions for nonlinear equations. In past few years there has been considerable interest in studying the following general fractional p-Laplacian problem

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta)_p^s u &= f(u) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega.\end{aligned}$$

In [19], the eigenvalue problem associated with $(-\Delta)_p^s$ has been studied. Some results about the existence of solutions have been considered in [17, 18, 19], see also the references therein.

On the other hand, the fractional problems for $p = 2$ have been investigated by many researchers, see for example [22] for the subcritical case, [3, 5, 23] for the critical case. In [6] the authors studied the nonlocal equation involving a concave-convex nonlinearity in the subcritical case. In [12] the existence of multiple positive solutions to $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ for both the subcritical and critical case were obtained. Existence of infinitely many nontrivial solution to $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ in both subcritical and critical cases and existence of at least one sign-changing

solution have been established in [5]. In the local case $s = 1$ equation with concave-convex nonlinearities were studied by many authors, to mention few, see [2, 1, 4, 10]. When $s = 1$ and $p = 2$, existence of sign changing solution was studied in [11].

In [16], Goyal and Sreenadh studied the existence and multiplicity of non-negative solutions of p-fractional equations with subcritical concave-convex nonlinearities. In [13], Chen and Squassina have studied the concave-critical system of equations with the $p-$fractional Laplace operator. More precisely, they studied:

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)_p^s u = \lambda|u|^{q-1}u + \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}|u|^{\alpha-2}u|v|^{\beta} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ (-\Delta)_p^s v = \lambda|v|^{q-1}u + \frac{2\beta}{\alpha+\beta}|v|^{\beta-2}v|u|^{\alpha} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha + \beta = p_s^*$, $0 < q < p-1$, $\alpha,\ \beta > 1$, $\lambda,\ \mu$ are two positive parameters. When $\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps} \le q < p-1$ and $N > p^2 s$, they have proved that there exists $\lambda_* > 0$ such that for $0 < \lambda^{\frac{p}{p-q}} + \mu^{\frac{p}{p-q}} < \lambda_*$, the above system of equations admits at least two nontrivial solutions.

Note that, if we set $\lambda = \mu$, $\alpha = \beta = \frac{p_s^*}{2}$ and $u = v$ then the above system reduces to $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$. Therefore, it follows that when $\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps} \le q < p-1$ and $N > p^2 s$, problem $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ admits two nontrivial solution for $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$, for some $\mu_* > 0$. It can be shown that the nontrivial solutions obtained in [13] are actually positive solutions of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ (see Remark 2.1 in Section 2).

The main result of this article is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Let $s \in (0,1)$, $p \ge 2$. Then there exist $\mu^* > 0$, $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_0 \in (0,\ p-1)$ such that for all $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, $N > N_0$ and $q \in (q_0,\ p-1)$, problem $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ has at least one sign changing solution, where N_0 is given by the following relation:*

$$N_0 := \begin{cases} sp(p+1) & \text{when} \quad 2 \le p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}, \\ sp(p^2-p+1) & \text{when} \quad p \ge \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Notations: Throughout this paper C denotes the generic constant which may vary from line to line. For a Banach space X, we denote by X', the dual space of X.

2. Existence of sign-changing solution

Define the Nehari-manifold N_μ by

$$N_\mu := \left\{ u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\} \,\middle|\, \langle I'_\mu(u), u\rangle_{X_0} = 0 \right\}.$$

The Nehari manifold N_μ is closely linked to the behavior of the fibering map $\varphi_u : (0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\varphi_u(r) := I_\mu(ru) = \frac{r^p}{p}||u||_{X_0}^p - \frac{\mu r^{q+1}}{q+1}|u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - \frac{r^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*}|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*},$$

which was first introduced by Drabek and Pohozaev in [15].

Lemma 2.1. *For any $u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\}$, we have $ru \in N_\mu$ if and only if $\varphi'_u(r) = 0$.*

Proof. We note that for $r > 0$, $\varphi'_u(r) = \langle I'_\mu(ru), u\rangle_{X_0} = \frac{1}{r}\langle I'_\mu(ru), ru\rangle_{X_0}$. Hence, $\varphi'_u(r) = 0$ if and only if $ru \in N_\mu$. □

Therefore, we can conclude that the elements in N_μ corresponds to the stationary point of the maps φ_u. Observe that

$$\varphi_u'(r) = r^{p-1}||u||_{X_0}^p - \mu r^q |u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - r^{p_s^*-1}|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\varphi_u''(r) = (p-1)r^{p-2}||u||_{X_0}^p - q\mu r^{q-1}|u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - (p_s^*-1)r^{p_s^*-2}|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}. \tag{2.2}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we note that $u \in N_\mu$ if and only if $\varphi_u'(1) = 0$. Hence for $u \in N_\mu$, using (2.1) and (2.2), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_u''(1) &= (p-1)||u||_{X_0}^p - q\mu|u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - (p_s^*-1)|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \\
&= (p-p_s^*)|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} + (1-q)\mu|u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} \\
&= (p-1-q)||u||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^*-1-q)|u|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \\
&= (p-p_s^*)||u||_{X_0}^p + (p_s^*-1-q)\mu|u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, we split the manifold into three parts corresponding to local minima, maxima and points of inflection

$$\begin{aligned}
N_\mu^+ &:= \left\{ u \in N_\mu \,\middle|\, \varphi_u''(1) > 0 \right\}, \\
N_\mu^- &:= \left\{ u \in N_\mu \,\middle|\, \varphi_u''(1) < 0 \right\}, \\
N_\mu^0 &:= \left\{ u \in N_\mu \,\middle|\, \varphi_u''(1) = 0 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. *From* [13]*, it follows that* $\inf_{u\in N_\mu^+} I_\mu(u)$ *and* $\inf_{u\in N_\mu^-} I_\mu(u)$ *are achieved and those two infimum points are two critical points of* I_μ*. Now if we define* I_μ^+ *as follows:*

$$I_\mu^+(u) := \frac{1}{p}\|u\|_{X_0}^p - \frac{\mu}{q+1}|u^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}|u^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^+ := \inf_{u\in N_\mu^+} I_\mu^+(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- := \inf_{u\in N_\mu^-} I_\mu^+(u), \tag{2.5}$$

then repeating the same analysis as in [13] *for* I_μ^+*, it can be shown that there exists* $\mu_* > 0$ *such that for* $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$*, there exists two non-trivial critical points* $w_0 \in N_\mu^+$ *and* $w_1 \in N_\mu^-$ *of* I_μ^+*. It is not difficult to see that* w_0 *and* w_1 *are nonnegative in* $\mathbb{R}^N$*. Indeed,*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left\langle (I_\mu^+)'(w_0), w_0^- \right\rangle \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|w_0(x)-w_0(y)|^{p-2}(w_0(x)-w_0(y))(w_0^-(x)-w_0^-(y))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|w_0(x)-w_0(y)|^{p-2}((w_0^-(x)-w_0^-(y))^2 + 2(w_0^-(x)w_0^+(y)))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|w_0^-(x)-w_0^-(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy = \left\|w_0^-\right\|_{X_0}^p.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Thus, $\left\|w_0^-\right\|_{X_0} = 0$ *and hence,* $w_0 = w_0^+$*. Similarly we can show* $w_1 = w_1^+$*. Using maximum principle* [7, Theorem A.1] *we conclude that both* w_0, w_1 *are positive almost everywhere in* Ω*. Hence* $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ *has at least two positive solutions.*

Set

$$\tilde{\mu} = \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-q-1}\right)^{\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-p}} \frac{p_s^*-p}{p_s^*-q-1} |\Omega|^{\frac{q+1-p_s^*}{p_p^*}} S^{\frac{N(p-1-q)}{p^2 s}+\frac{q+1}{p}}. \tag{2.7}$$

Next we prove three elementary lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$. For every $u \in X_0,\ u \neq 0$, there exists unique*

$$t^-(u) < t_0(u) = \left(\frac{(p-1-q)||u||^p_{X_0}}{(p_s^*-1-q)|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N-ps}{p^2 s}} < t^+(u),$$

such that

$$t^-(u)u \in N_\mu^+ \quad \text{and} \quad I_\mu(t^-u) = \min_{t\in[0,t_0]} I_\mu(tu),$$
$$t^+(u)u \in N_\mu^- \quad \text{and} \quad I_\mu(t^+u) = \max_{t\geq t_0} I_\mu(tu).$$

Proof. For $t \geq 0$,

$$I_\mu(tu) = \frac{t^p}{p}||u||^p_{X_0} - \frac{\mu t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} - \frac{t^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*}|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} I_\mu(tu) = t^q\left(t^{p-1-q}||u||^p_{X_0} - t^{p_s^*-q-1}|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}\right).$$

Define

$$\psi(t) = t^{p-1-q}||u||^p_{X_0} - t^{p_s^*-q-1}|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.8}$$

By a straight forward computation, it follows that ψ attains maximum at the point

$$t_0 = t_0(u) = \left(\frac{(p-1-q)||u||^p_{X_0}}{(p_s^*-1-q)|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Thus

$$\psi'(t_0) = 0, \quad \psi'(t) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad t < t_0, \quad \psi'(t) < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad t > t_0. \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, $\psi(t_0) = \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-1-q}\right)^{\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-p}} \left(\frac{p_s^*-p}{p_s^*-1-q}\right) \left(\frac{||u||^{p(p_s^*-1-q)}_{X_0}}{|u|^{p_s^*(p-1-q)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N-ps}{p^2 s}}$. Therefore using Sobolev embedding, we have

$$\psi(t_0) \geq \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-1-q}\right)^{\frac{(p-1-q)(N-2s)}{4s}} \left(\frac{p_s^*-p}{p_s^*-1-q}\right) S^{\frac{N(p-1-q)}{p^2 s}} ||u||^{q+1}_{X_0}. \tag{2.11}$$

Using Hölder inequality followed by Sobolev inequality, and the fact that $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$, we obtain

$$\mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1} dx \leq \mu ||u||^{q+1}_{X_0} S^{-(q+1)/p} |\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}} \leq \tilde{\mu}||u||^{q+1}_{X_0} S^{-(q+1)/p} |\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}} \leq \psi(t_0),$$

where in the last inequality we have used expression of $\tilde{\mu}$ (see (2.7)) and (2.11). Hence, there exists $t^+(u) > t_0 > t^-(u)$ such that

$$\psi(t^+) = \mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1} = \psi(t^-) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'(t^+) < 0 < \psi'(t^-). \tag{2.12}$$

This in turn, implies $t^+u \in N_\mu^-$ and $t^-u \in N_\mu^+$. Moreover, using (2.10) and (2.12) in the expression of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu)$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) > 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t \in (t^-, t^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) < 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t \in [0, t^-) \cup (t^+, \infty),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t = t^\pm.$$

We note that $I_\mu(tu) = 0$ at $t = 0$ and strictly negative when $t > 0$ is small enough. Therefore it is easy to conclude that

$$\max_{t \geq t_0} I_\mu(tu) = I_\mu(t^+u) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{t \in [0,t_0]} J_\mu(tu) = I_\mu(t^-u).$$

□

Repeating the same argument as in Lemma 2.2, we can also prove that the following lemma holds:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$, where $\tilde{\mu}$ is defined as in (2.7). For every $u \in X_0$, $u \neq 0$, there exist unique*

$$\tilde{t}^-(u) < \tilde{t}_0(u) = \left(\frac{(p-1-q)||u||_{X_0}^p}{(p_s^*-1-q)|u^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}} \right)^{\frac{N-ps}{p^2 s}} < \tilde{t}^+(u),$$

such that

$$\tilde{t}^-(u)u \in N_\mu^+ \quad \textit{and} \quad I_\mu^+(\tilde{t}^-u) = \min_{t \in [0,t_0]} I_\mu^+(tu),$$
$$\tilde{t}^+(u)u \in N_\mu^- \quad \textit{and} \quad I_\mu^+(\tilde{t}^+u) = \max_{t \geq t_0} I_\mu^+(tu),$$

where I_μ^+ is defined as in (2.4).

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be defined as in (2.7). Then $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$, implies $N_\mu^0 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exists $w \in N_\mu^0$ such that $w \neq 0$ and

$$(p-1-q)||w||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^*-q-1)|w^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

The above expression combined with Sobolev inequality yields

$$||w||_{X_0} \geq S^{\frac{N}{p^2 s}} \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-1-q} \right)^{\frac{N-ps}{p^2 s}}. \tag{2.14}$$

As $w \in N_\mu^0 \subseteq N_\mu$, using (2.13) and Hölder inequality followed by Sobolev inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= ||w||_{X_0}^p - |w|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} - \mu|w|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} \\ &\geq ||w||_{X_0}^p - \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-q-1} \right) ||w||_{X_0}^p - \mu|\Omega|^{1-\frac{q+1}{p_s^*}} S^{-(q+1)/p} ||w||_{X_0}^{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality with (2.14) and using $\mu < \tilde{\mu}$, we have

$$0 \geq ||w||_{X_0}^{q+1} \left[\left(\frac{p_s^*-p}{p_s^*-q-1} \right) \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-q-1} \right)^{\frac{(N-ps)(p-1-q)}{p^2 s}} S^{\frac{N(p-1-q)}{p^2 s}} - \mu|\Omega|^{1-\frac{q+1}{p_s^*}} S^{-(q+1)/p} \right] > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\tilde{\mu}$ is as defined in (2.7) and $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$. Given $u \in N_\mu^-$, there exists $\rho_u > 0$ and a differentiable function $g_{\rho_u} : B_{\rho_u}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the following:*

$$g_{\rho_u}(0) = 1,$$
$$\big(g_{\rho_u}(w)\big)(u+w) \in N_\mu^- \quad \forall \quad w \in B_{\rho_u}(0),$$
$$\big\langle g'_{\rho_u}(0), \phi\big\rangle = \frac{pA(u,\phi) - p_s^* \displaystyle\int_\Omega |u|^{p_s^*-2}u\phi - (q+1)\mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q-1}u\phi}{(p-1-q)||u||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^*-q-1)|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}} \quad \forall\, \phi \in B_{\rho_u}(0),$$

where

$$A(u,\phi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^{p-2}(u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} dxdy.$$

Proof. Define $E : \mathbb{R} \times X_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$E(r,w) = r^{p-1-q}||u+w||_{X_0}^p - r^{p_p^*-q-1}|(u+w)|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|(u+w)|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.$$

We note that $u \in N_\mu^- \subset N_\mu$ implies

$$E(1,0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial E}{\partial r}(1,0) = (p-1-q)||u||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^*-q-1)|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} < 0.$$

Therefore, by implicit function theorem, there exists neighborhood $B_{\rho_u}(0) \subset N_\mu$ for some $\rho_u > 0$ and a C^1 function $g_{\rho_u} : B_{\rho_u}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$(i)\ g_{\rho_u}(0) = 1, \quad (ii)\ E(g_{\rho_u}(w), w) = 0,\ \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0),$$
$$(iii) E_r(g_{\rho_u}(w), w) < 0,\ \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0), \quad (iv)\ \big\langle g'_{\rho_u}(0), \phi\big\rangle = -\frac{\big\langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial w}(1,0), \phi\big\rangle}{\frac{\partial E}{\partial r}(1,0)}.$$

Multiplying (ii) by $(g_{\rho_u}(w))^{q+1}$, it follows that $g_{\rho_u}(w)(u+w) \in N_\mu$. In fact, simplifying (iii), we obtain

$$(p-1-q)g_{\rho_u}(w)^p||u+w||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^*-q-1)g_{\rho_u}(w)^{p_s^*}|(u+w)|^{p_s^*}_{p_s^*} < 0 \quad \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0).$$

Thus $\big(g_{\rho_u}(w)\big)(u+w) \in N_\mu^-$, for every $w \in B_{\rho_u}(0)$. The last assertion of the lemma follows from (iv). □

Let S be as in (1.3). From [9], we know that for $1 < p < \infty, s \in (0,1), N > ps$, there exists a minimizer for S, and for every minimizer U, there exist $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a constant sign monotone function $u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $U(x) = u(|x - x_0|)$. In the following, we shall fix a radially symmetric nonnegative decreasing minimizer $U = U(r)$ for S. Multiplying U by a positive constant if necessary, we may assume that

$$(-\Delta)_p^s U = U^{p_s^*-1} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \tag{2.15}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we note that the function function

$$U_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-sp)}{p}}} U\left(\frac{|x|}{\varepsilon}\right) \tag{2.16}$$

is also a minimizer for S satisfying (2.15). From [20], we also have the following asymptotic estimates for U.

Lemma 2.6. [20] *Let U be the solution of (2.15). Then, there exists $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $\theta > 1$ such that for all $r \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{c_1}{r^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}} \leq U(r) \leq \frac{c_2}{r^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}} \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$\frac{U(r\theta)}{U(r)} \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.18}$$

Proof. See [lemma 2.2 [20]]. □

Therefore we have,

$$c_1 \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}}{|x|^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}} \leq U_\varepsilon(x) \leq c_2 \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}}{|x|^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > \varepsilon. \tag{2.19}$$

We consider a cut-off function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $\psi \equiv 1$ in Ω_δ, $\psi \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$, where

$$\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta\}.$$

Define

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \psi(x) U_\varepsilon(x). \tag{2.20}$$

We need the following lemmas in order to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose w_1 is a positive solution of (P_μ) and u_ε is as defined in* (2.20)*. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, small enough*

(i) $A_1 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1^{p_s^*-1} u_\varepsilon dx \leq k_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}}$;

(ii) $A_2 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1^{q} u_\varepsilon dx \leq k_2 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}}$;

(iii) $A_3 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1 u_\varepsilon^{q} dx \leq k_3 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}q}$;

(iv) $A_4 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1 u_\varepsilon^{p_s^*-1} dx \leq k_4 \varepsilon^{\frac{N(p-1)+ps}{p(p-1)}}$.

Proof. Applying the Moser iteration technique (see [8, Theorem 3.3]), it can be shown that any positive solution of (P_μ) is in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let $R,\ M > 0$ be such that $\Omega \subset B(0,R)$ and $|w_1|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < M$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad A_1 = \int_\Omega w_1^{p_s^*-1} u_\varepsilon dx &\leq C\left[\int_{\Omega\cap\{|x|\leq\varepsilon\}} U_\varepsilon(x)dx + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}} \int_{\Omega\cap\{|x|>\varepsilon\}} \frac{dx}{|x|^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}}\right] \\
&\leq C\left[\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)}{p}} \int_{\{|x|<1\}} U(x)dx + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}} \int_{B(0,R)} \frac{dx}{|x|^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}} dx\right] \\
&\leq C\left[\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)}{p}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}} \int_0^R r^{N-1-\frac{N-sp}{p-1}} dr\right] \\
&\leq k_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (ii) similar to (i).

$$\begin{aligned}(iii)\quad A_3=\int_\Omega w_1u_\varepsilon^q dx &\le C\Big[\int_{\Omega\cap\{|x|\le\varepsilon\}}U_\varepsilon^q(x)dx+\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}q}\int_{\Omega\cap\{|x|>\varepsilon\}}\frac{dx}{|x|^{\frac{(N-sp)q}{p-1}}}\Big]\\ &\le C\Big[\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)q}{p}}\int_{\{|x|<1\}}U(x)^q dx+\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-sp)q}{p(p-1)}}\int_{B(0,R)}\frac{dx}{|x|^{\frac{(N-sp)q}{p-1}}}dx\Big]\\ &\le C\Big[\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)q}{p}}+\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p(p-1)}q}\int_0^R r^{N-1-\frac{N-sp}{p-1}q}dr\Big]\\ &\le k_3\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}q},\end{aligned}$$

since $0<q<p-1<\frac{N(p-1)}{N-sp}$. (iv) can be proved as in (iii). □

Lemma 2.8. *Let u_ε be as defined in (2.20), $0<q<p-1$ and $N>p^2s$. Then for every $\varepsilon>0$, small*

$$\int_\Omega |u_\epsilon|^{q+1}dx\ge\begin{cases}k_5\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p(p-1)}} & \text{if}\quad 0<q<\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps},\\ k_6\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}}|ln\ \varepsilon|, & \text{if}\quad q=\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps},\\ k_7\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}} & \text{if}\quad \frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps}<q<p-1.\end{cases}$$

Proof. We recall that $R'>0$ was chosen such that $B(0,R')\subset\Omega_\delta$. Therefore, for $\varepsilon>0$ small, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx &\ge \int_{B(0,R')}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx\\ &= \int_{B(0,R')}U_\varepsilon^{q+1}(x)dx\\ &= C\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p}}\int_{B\left(0,\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}\right)}U^{q+1}(y)dy \qquad (2.21)\\ &\ge C\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}}\int_{B\left(0,\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}\right)\setminus B(0,1)}U^{q+1}(y)dy\\ &\ge C\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}}\int_1^{\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}}r^{N-1-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p-1}}dr. \qquad (2.22)\end{aligned}$$

Case 1 : $0<q\le\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps}$.
We note that

$$\int_1^{\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}}r^{(N-1)-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p-1}}dr\ge C_1\varepsilon^{-N+\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p-1}}-C_2, \qquad (2.23)$$

Thus substituting back in (2.17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx &\ge C\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}}[C_1\varepsilon^{-N+\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p-1}}-C_2]\\ &= C_3\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p(p-1)}}-C_4\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}}\\ &\ge k_5\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p(p-1)}}. \qquad (2.24)\end{aligned}$$

Case 2 : $q = \frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps}$.
In this case it follows

$$\int_1^{\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}} r^{N-1-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p-1}} dr \geq C|\ln \varepsilon|.$$

Plugging back in (2.17), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1} dx \geq k_6 \varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}} |\ln \varepsilon| = k_6 \varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}} |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

Case 3 : $\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps} < q < p-1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS of (2.16)} &\geq k_7 \varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p}} \int_{B(0,1)} U^{q+1}(x) dx \\ &\geq k_7 \varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Hence the lemma follows.

□

Definition 2.1. *We say $\{u_n\}$ is a Palais Smale (PS) sequence of I_μ at level c (in short $(PS)_c$) if $I_\mu(u_n) \to c$ and $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$. Furthermore, we say I_μ satisfies Palais-Smale condition at level c if for all $\{u_n\} \subset X_0$ with $I_\mu(u_n) \to c$ and $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$, implies up to a subsequence u_n converges strongly in X_0.*

Let us define

$$M := \frac{(pN-(N-ps)(q+1))(p-1-q)}{p^2(q+1)} \left(\frac{(p-1-q)(N-sp)}{p^2 s}\right)^{\frac{q+1}{p_s^*-q-1}} |\Omega|. \tag{2.26}$$

Lemma 2.9. *Let M be as in (2.26). For any $\mu > 0$, and for*

$$c < \frac{s}{N} S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}},$$

I_μ satisfies $(PS)_c$ condition.

Proof. Let $\{u_k\} \subset X_0$ be a $(PS)_c$ sequence for I_μ, that is, we have $I_\mu(u_k) \to c$ and $I'_\mu(u_k) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$ as $k \to \infty$. By the standard method it is not difficult to see that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in X_0. Then up to a subsequence, still denoted by u_k, there exists $u_\infty \in X_0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &u_k \rightharpoonup u_\infty \quad \text{weakly in} \quad X_0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \\ &u_k \rightharpoonup u_\infty \quad \text{weakly in} \quad L^{p_s^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \\ &u_k \to u_\infty \quad \text{strongly in} \quad L^r(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{for any} \quad 1 \leq r < p_s^* \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \\ &u_k \to u_\infty \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

As $0 < q < p-1$, we have

$$\int_\Omega |u_k|^{q+1}(x) dx \to \int_\Omega |u_\infty|^{q+1}(x) dx \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Using these above properties it can be shown that $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty), \varphi \right\rangle_{X_0} = 0$ for any $\varphi \in X_0$.

Indeed for any $\varphi \in X_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle I'_\mu(u_k),\varphi\rangle - \langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),\varphi\rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^{p-2}(u_k(x)-u_k(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_\infty(x)-u_\infty(y)|^{p-2}(u_\infty(x)-u_\infty(y))(\varphi(x)-\varphi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \\ &- \mu\left(\int_\Omega |u_k|^{q-1}u_k\varphi\ dx - \int_\Omega |u_\infty|^{q-1}u_\infty\varphi\ dx\right) \\ &- \left(\int_\Omega |u_k|^{p_s^*-2}u_k\varphi\ dx - \int_\Omega |u_\infty|^{p_s^*-2}u_\infty\varphi\ dx\right).\end{aligned}$$

As $\left\{\frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^{p-2}(u_k(x)-u_k(y))}{|x-y|^{\frac{N+sp}{p'}}}\right\}_{k\geq 1}$ is bounded in $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$, where $p'=\frac{p}{p-1}$, upto a subsequence

$$\frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^{p-2}(u_k(x)-u_k(y))}{|x-y|^{\frac{N+sp}{p'}}} \rightharpoonup \frac{|u_\infty(x)-u_\infty(y)|^{p-2}(u_\infty(x)-u_\infty(y))}{|x-y|^{\frac{N+sp}{p'}}}$$

weakly in $L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^{2N})$, $u_k \rightharpoonup u_\infty$ weakly in $L^{p_s^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $L^{q+1}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $k\to\infty$.

Combining these we have $\langle I'_\mu(u_k),\varphi\rangle - \langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),\varphi\rangle \to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. But as $I'_\mu(u_k)\to 0$ in X_0' as $k\to\infty$, we have $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),\varphi\right\rangle_{X_0} = 0$ for any $\varphi\in X_0$. Hence, in particular $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),u_\infty\right\rangle_{X_0}=0$.

Furthermore, by Brezis-Lieb lemma as $k\to\infty$, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_k(x)-u_\infty(x)-u_k(y)+u_\infty(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_\infty(x)-u_\infty(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy + o(1)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega |u_k(x)|^{p_s^*}dx = \int_\Omega |(u_k-u_\infty)(x)|^{p_s^*}dx + \int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p_s^*}dx + o(1).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle I'_\mu(u_k),u_k\right\rangle_{X_o} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|u_k(x)-u_k(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy - \mu\int_\Omega |u_k(x)|^{q+1}dx - \int_\Omega |u_k(x)|^{p_s^*}dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \frac{|u_k(x)-u_\infty(x)-u_k(y)+u_\infty(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy - \int_\Omega |u_k(x)-u_\infty(x)|^{p_s^*}dx \\ &+ \left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),u_\infty\right\rangle_{X_0} + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Since as $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty),u_\infty\right\rangle_{X_0}=0$ and $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_k),u_k\right\rangle_{X_0}\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$, we have that there exists $b\in\mathbb{R}$ with $b\geq 0$ such that

$$||u_k-u_\infty||^p_{X_0} = \int_Q \frac{|u_k(x)-u_\infty(x)-u_k(y)+u_\infty(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+sp}}dxdy \to b \tag{2.27}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega |(u_k-u_\infty)(x)|^{p_s^*}dx \to b \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \tag{2.28}$$

If $b = 0$, we are done. Suppose $b > 0$. Moreover, using Sobolev inequality we have,

$$||u_k - u_\infty||^p_{X_0} \geq S\left(\int_\Omega (|u_k - u_\infty)(x)|^{p^*_s} dx\right)^{p/p^*_s}.$$

Therefore, $b \geq Sb^{p/p^*_s}$, and this implies $b \geq S^{N/sp}$. On the other hand, since $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty), u_\infty \right\rangle_{X_0} = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu(u_\infty) &= I_\mu(u_\infty) - \frac{1}{p}\left\langle I'_\mu(u_\infty), u_\infty \right\rangle_{X_0} \\ &= \frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{q+1} dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Using (2.29) and $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_k), u_k \right\rangle_{X_0} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \lim_{k\to\infty} I_\mu(u_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty}[I_\mu(u_k) - \frac{1}{p}\left\langle I'_\mu(u_k), u_k \right\rangle_{X_0}] \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\left[\frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |(u_k - u_\infty)(x)|^{p^*_s} dx + \frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u_k(x)|^{q+1} dx\right] \\ &= \frac{s}{N}b + \frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{q+1} dx \\ &\geq \frac{s}{N}S^{N/sp} + \frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{q+1} dx \qquad (2.30) \\ &= \frac{s}{N}S^{N/sp} + I_\mu(u_\infty). \qquad (2.31) \end{aligned}$$

Since, by assumption we have $c < \frac{s}{N}S^{N/sp}$, the last inequality implies $I_\mu(u_\infty) < 0$. In particular, $u_\infty \not\equiv 0$ and

$$0 < \frac{1}{p}||u_\infty||^p_{X_0} < \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega (u_\infty(x))^{q+1} dx + \frac{1}{p^*_s}\int_\Omega (u_\infty(x))^{p^*_s} dx.$$

Moreover, by Hölder inequality we have,

$$\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{q+1} dx \leq |\Omega|^{\frac{p^*_s-(q+1)}{p^*_s}}\left(\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx\right)^{\frac{q+1}{p^*_s}}.$$

Thus, from (2.30)

$$\begin{aligned} c &\geq \frac{s}{N}S^{N/sp} + \frac{s}{N}\int_\Omega |u_\infty|^{p^*_s} dx + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)|\Omega|^{\frac{p^*_s-(q+1)}{p^*_s}}\left(\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx\right)^{\frac{q+1}{p^*_s}} \\ &:= \frac{s}{N}S^{N/sp} + h(\eta), \end{aligned}$$

where $h(\eta) = \frac{s}{N}\eta^{p^*_s} + \mu\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)|\Omega|^{\frac{p^*_s-(q+1)}{p^*_s}}\eta^{q+1}$ with $\eta = \left(\int_\Omega |u_\infty(x)|^{p^*_s} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p^*_s}}$. By elementary analysis, we can show that h attains its minimum at $\eta_0 = \left(\frac{\mu(p-1-q)(N-sp)}{p^2 s}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^*_s-(q+1)}}|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p^*_s}}$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\eta_0) &= \frac{s}{N}\left(\frac{\mu(p-1-q)(N-sp)}{p^2 s}\right)^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-(q+1)}}|\Omega| \\ &- \frac{\mu(p-1-q)}{p(q+1)}|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-(q+1)}{p_s^*}}\left(\frac{\mu(p-1-q)(N-sp)}{p^2 s}\right)^{\frac{q+1}{p_s^*-(q+1)}}|\Omega|^{\frac{q+1}{p_s^*}} \\ &= -M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-(q+1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

with M given in (2.26). This in turn implies $c \geq \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-(q+1)}}$ and that gives a contradiction to our hypothesis. Hence $b = 0$. This concludes that $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in X_0. □

Lemma 2.10. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $N > \frac{sp}{2}[p+1+\sqrt{(p+1)^2-4}]$ and $q \in (q_1, p-1)$, where*

$$q_1 := \frac{N^2(p-1)}{(N-sp)(N-s)} - 1. \tag{2.32}$$

Then, there exists $\tilde{\mu}_1 > 0$ and $u_0 \in X_0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} I_\mu^+(tu_0) < \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}}, \tag{2.33}$$

for $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu}_1)$. In particular,

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- < \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}} \tag{2.34}$$

where I_μ^+ is defined as in (2.4) and α_μ^- and M are given as in (2.5) and (2.26) respectively.

Proof. Let u_ε be as defined in (2.20). Then we claim

$$|u_\varepsilon^+|_{L^{p_s^*}} = |u_\varepsilon|_{L^{p_s^*}}^{p_s^*} \geq S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}). \tag{2.35}$$

To see this,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_\varepsilon|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} &= \int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*}dx \geq \int_{\Omega_\delta} |u_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*}dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_\delta} |U_\varepsilon(x)|^{p_s^*}dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |U_\varepsilon(x)|^{p_s^*}dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega_\delta} |U_\varepsilon(x)|^{p_s^*}dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega_\delta} |U_\varepsilon(x)|^{p_s^*}dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B(0,R')} |U_\varepsilon(x)|^{p_s^*}dx &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B(0,R')} U^{p_s^*}(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})dx \\ &\leq C\int_{\frac{R'}{\varepsilon}}^\infty r^{N-1-\frac{Np}{p-1}}dr \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore substituting back to (2.36) we obtain

$$|u_\varepsilon|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \geq S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p-1}}.$$

Furthermore, a similar analysis as in [23, Proposition 21] (see also [20, Lemma 2.7]) yields, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small ($0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\delta}{2}$) we have,

$$||u_\varepsilon||^p_{X_0} \leq S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p-1}}). \tag{2.37}$$

Define,

$$J(u) := \frac{1}{p}||u||^p_{X_0} - \frac{1}{p^*_s}|u^+|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}}, \quad u \in X_0$$

and choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small such that (2.37) and (2.35) hold and Lemma 2.8 is satisfied. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Then, consider corresponding $u_0 := u_{\varepsilon_0}$. Let us consider the function $h : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $h(t) = J(tu_0)$ for all $t \geq 0$. It can be shown that h attains its maximum at $t = t_* = \left(\frac{||u_0||^p_{X_0}}{|u_0^+|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^*-p}}$ and $\sup_{t\geq 0} J(tu_0) = \frac{s}{N}\left(\frac{||u_0||^p_{X_0}}{|u_0^+|^p_{L^{p^*_s}}}\right)^{\frac{N}{sp}}$. Using (2.37) and (2.35) a straight forward computation yields,

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} J(tu_0) \leq \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}). \tag{2.38}$$

Since $I^+_\mu(tu_0) < 0$ for t small, we can find $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq t_0} I^+_\mu(tu_0) \leq \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} - M\mu^{\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1}},$$

for $\mu > 0$ small. Hence, we are left to estimate $\sup_{t_0\leq t} I^+_\mu(tu_0)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\geq t_0} I^+_\mu(tu_0) &= \sup_{t\geq t_0}[J(tu_0) - \frac{t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_0^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}}] \\
&\leq \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + o(\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}}) - \frac{t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_0|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + c_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p-1}} - c_2\mu\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p(p-1)}}, & 0 < q < \frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-sp} \\ \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + c_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p-1}} - c_2\mu\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{p}}|ln\varepsilon|, & q = \frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-sp} \\ \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + c_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p-1}} - c_2\mu\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p}}, & \frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-sp} < q < p-1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\delta}{2})$ such that $\varepsilon^{\frac{N-sp}{p-1}} = \mu^{\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1}}$. Then for $\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-sp} < q < p-1$, the term $\frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + c_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p-1}} - c_2\mu\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p}}$ reduces to $\frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{sp}} + c_1\mu^{\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1}} - c_2\mu\left(\mu^{\frac{p^*}{p^*-q-1}}\right)^{(N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p})(\frac{p-1}{N-ps})}$.
Now, note that we can make

$$c_1\mu^{\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1}} - c_2\mu\left(\mu^{\frac{p^*}{p^*-q-1}}\right)^{(N-\frac{(N-sp)(q+1)}{p})(\frac{p-1}{N-ps})} < -M\mu^{\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1}},$$

for $\mu > 0$ small if we further choose $(\frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1})(\frac{p-1}{p})[\frac{Np}{N-ps} - (q+1)] < \frac{p^*_s}{p^*_s-q-1} - 1$ i.e., if $q + 1 > \frac{N^2(p-1)}{(N-sp)(N-s)}$. This proves (2.33). It is easy to see that (2.34) follows by combining (2.33) along with Lemma 2.3 .

□

2.1. **Sign changing critical points of I_μ.** Define

$$\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1} := \{u \in N_\mu : u^+ \in N^-_\mu\},$$

$$\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,2} := \{u \in N_\mu : -u^- \in N^-_\mu\},$$

We set

$$\beta_1 = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}} I_\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_2 = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,2}} I_\mu(u). \tag{2.39}$$

Theorem 2.1. *Let $p \geq 2$, $N > \frac{sp}{2}[p+1+\sqrt{(p+1)^2-4}]$ and $q_1 < q < p-1$, where q_1 is defined as in (2.32). Assume $0 < \mu < min\{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}_1, \mu_*, \mu_1\}$, where $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\mu}_1$ and μ_1 are as in (2.7), Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 3.1 respectively. μ_* is chosen such that $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ is achieved in $(0,\mu_*)$. Let β_1, β_2, $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ be defined as in (2.39) and (2.5) respectively.*

(i) *Let $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$. Then, there exists a sign changing critical point $\tilde{w}_1$ of I_μ such that $\tilde{w}_1 \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ and $I_\mu(\tilde{w}_1) = \beta_1$.*

(ii) *If $\beta_2 < \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$, then there exists a sign changing critical point $\tilde{w}_2$ of I_μ such that $\tilde{w}_2 \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ and $I_\mu(\tilde{w}_2) = \beta_2$.*

Proof. (i) Let $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$. We prove the theorem in few steps.

Step 1: $\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ and $\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,2}$ are closed sets.
To see this, let $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ such that $u_n \to u$ in X_0. It is easy to note that $|u_n|, |u| \in X_0$ and $|u_n| \to |u|$ in X_0. This in turn implies $u_n^+ \to u^+$ in X_0 and $L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\gamma \in [1, p_s^*]$ (by Sobolev inequality). Since, $u_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$, we have $u_n^+ \in N^-_\mu$. Therefore

$$||u_n^+||^p_{X_0} - |u_n^+|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|u_n^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = 0 \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$(p-1-q)||u_n^+||^p_{X_0} - (p_s^*-q-1)|u_n^+|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} < 0 \ \forall\ n \geq 1. \tag{2.41}$$

Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain $u^+ \in N_\mu$ and
$(p-1-q)||u^+||^p_{X_0} - (p_s^*-q-1)|u^+|^{[p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \leq 0$. But, from Lemma 2.4, we know $N^0_\mu = \emptyset$. Therefore $u^+ \in N^-_\mu$ and hence $\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ is closed. Similarly it can be shown that $\mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,2}$ is also closed. Hence step 1 follows.

By Ekeland Variational Principle there exists sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ such that

$$I_\mu(u_n) \to \beta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad I_\mu(z) \geq I_\mu(u_n) - \frac{1}{n}||u_n - z||_{X_0} \quad \forall\ z \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}. \tag{2.42}$$

Step 2: $\{u_n\}$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.
To see this, we notice $u_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$ implies $u_n \in N_\mu$ and this in turn implies $\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n\rangle = 0$, that is,

$$||u_n||^p_{X_0} = |u_n|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} + \mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Since $I_\mu(u_n) \to \beta_1$, using the above equality in the expression of $I_\mu(u_n)$, we get, for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s}{N}||u_n||^p_{X_0} &\leq \beta_1 + 1 + \left(\frac{1}{q+1} - \frac{1}{p_s^*}\right)\mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(1 + ||u_n||^{q+1}_{X_0}). \end{aligned}$$

As $p > q+1$, the above implies $\{u_n\}$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.
We note that for any $u \in X_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
||u||^p_{X_0} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^p}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{(|u(x)-u(y)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{\Big(\big|(u^+(x)-u^+(y))-(u^-(x)-u^-(y))\big|^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{\Big((u^+(x)-u^+(y))^2+(u^-(x)-u^-(y))^2+2u^+(x)u^-(y)+2u^+(y)u^-(x)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{\Big((u^+(x)-u^+(y))^2+(u^-(x)-u^-(y))^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{\Big((u^+(x)-u^+(y))^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{\Big((u^-(x)-u^-(y))^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\
&= ||u^+||^p_{X_0} + ||u^-||^p_{X_0} \qquad (2.43)
\end{aligned}$$

By a simple calculation, it follows

$$|u|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} = |u^+|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} + |u^-|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad |u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = |u^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} + |u^-|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}. \quad (2.44)$$

Combining (2.43) and (2.44), we obtain

$$I_\mu(u) \geq I_\mu(u^+) + I_\mu(u^-) \quad \forall \quad u \in X_0. \qquad (2.45)$$

Step 3: There exists $b > 0$ such that $||u_n^-||_{X_0} \geq b$ for all $n \geq 1$.
Suppose the step is not true. Then for each $k \geq 1$, there exists u_{n_k} such that

$$||u^-_{n_k}||_{X_0} < \frac{1}{k} \ \forall \ k \ \geq 1. \qquad (2.46)$$

Therefore, $||u^-_{n_k}||_{X_0} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and by Sobolev inequality

$$|u^-_{n_k}|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \to 0, \ \ |u^-_{n_k}|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Consequently, $I_\mu(u^-_{n_k}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. As a result, using (2.45) we have

$$\beta_1 = I_\mu(u_{n_k}) + o(1) \geq I_\mu(u^+_{n_k}) + I_\mu(u^-_{n_k}) + o(1) = I^+_\mu(u^+_{n_k}) + o(1) \geq \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu + o(1).$$

This is a contradiction to the hypothesis. Hence step 3 follows.

Step 4: $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$ as $n \to \infty$.

Since $u_n \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$, we have $u^+_n \in N^-_\mu$. Thus by Lemma 2.5 applied to the element u^+_n, there exists

$$\rho_n := \rho_{u^+_n} \quad \text{and} \quad g_n := g_{\rho_{u^+_n}}, \qquad (2.47)$$

such that

$$g_n(0) = 1, \quad \big(g_n(w)\big)(u^+_n + w) \in N^-_\mu \quad \forall \quad w \in B_{\rho_n}(0). \qquad (2.48)$$

Choose $0 < \tilde{\rho}_n < \rho_n$ such that $\tilde{\rho}_n \to 0$. Let $v \in X_0$ with $||v||_{X_0} = 1$. Define

$$v_n := -\tilde{\rho}_n[v^+\chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}} - v^-\chi_{\{u_n \leq 0\}}]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} &:= \big(g_n(v_n^-)\big)(u_n - v_n) \\ &=: z^1_{\tilde{\rho}_n} - z^2_{\tilde{\rho}_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $z^1_{\tilde{\rho}_n} := \big(g_n(v_n^-)\big)(u_n^+ + \tilde{\rho}_n v^+ \chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}})$ and $z^2_{\tilde{\rho}_n} := \big(g_n(v_n^-)\big)(u_n^- + \tilde{\rho}_n v^- \chi_{\{u_n \leq 0\}})$. Note that $v_n^- = \tilde{\rho}_n v^+ \chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}}$. So, $||v_n^-||_{X_0} \leq \tilde{\rho}_n ||v||_{X_0} \leq \tilde{\rho}_n$. Hence taking $w = v_n^-$ in (2.48) we have, $z^+_{\tilde{\rho}_n} = z^1_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \in N_\mu^-$ so $z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \in N^-_{\mu,1}$. Hence,

$$I_\mu(z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}) \geq I_\mu(u_n) - \frac{1}{n}||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0}.$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0} &\geq I_\mu(u_n) - I_\mu(z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}) \\ &= \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \right\rangle + o(1)||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0} \\ &= -\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \right\rangle + o(1)||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

as $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n \right\rangle = 0$ for all n. Let $w_n = \tilde{\rho}_n v$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0} \geq &-\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), w_n + z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \right\rangle + \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), w_n \right\rangle \\ &+o(1)||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

Now, $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), w_n \right\rangle = \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), \tilde{\rho}_n v \right\rangle = \tilde{\rho}_n \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \right\rangle$. Define

$$\overline{v_n} := v^+ \chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}} - v^- \chi_{\{u_n \leq 0\}}.$$

So, $z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} = g_n(v_n^-)(u_n - \tilde{\rho}_n \overline{v_n})$. Hence we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), w_n + z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \right\rangle = \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), w_n + g_n(v_n^-)(u_n - \tilde{\rho}_n \overline{v_n}) \right\rangle &= \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), \tilde{\rho}_n v - g_n(v_n^-)\tilde{\rho}_n \overline{v_n} \right\rangle \\ &= \tilde{\rho}_n \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v - g_n(v_n^-)\overline{v_n} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

Using (2.51) in (2.50), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0} \geq &-\tilde{\rho}_n \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v - g_n(v_n^-)\overline{v_n} \right\rangle \\ &+\tilde{\rho}_n \left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \right\rangle + o(1)||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

First we will estimate $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v - g_n(v_n^-)\overline{v_n} \right\rangle$. For this,

$$\begin{aligned} v - g_n(v_n^-)\overline{v_n} &= v^+ - v^- - g_n(v_n^-)[v^+ \chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}} - v^- \chi_{\{u_n \leq 0\}}] \\ &= v^+[g_n(0) - g_n(v_n^-)\chi_{\{u_n \geq 0\}}] - v^-[g_n(0) - g_n(v_n^-)\chi_{\{u_n \leq 0\}}] \\ &= -v^+[\left\langle g'_n(0), v_n^- \right\rangle + o(1)||v_n^-||_{X_0}] + v^-[\left\langle g'_n(0), v_n^- \right\rangle + o(1)||v_n^-||_{X_0}] \\ &= -v^+ \tilde{\rho}_n[\left\langle g'_n(0), v^+ \right\rangle + o(1)||v^+||_{X_0}] + v^- \tilde{\rho}_n[\left\langle g'_n(0), v^+ \right\rangle + o(1)||v^+||_{X_0}] \\ &= -\tilde{\rho}_n\big[\left\langle g'_n(0), v^+ \right\rangle + o(1)||v^+||_{X_0}\big]v. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v - g_n(v_n^-)\overline{v_n} \right\rangle = -\tilde{\rho}_n\big(\left\langle g'_n(0), v^+ \right\rangle + o(1)\left\|v^+\right\|\big)\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \right\rangle. \tag{2.53}$$

Claim : $g_n(v_n^-)$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.

To see this, we observe that from (2.48) we have, $g_n(v_n^-)(u_n^+ + v_n^-) \in N_\mu^- \subset N_\mu$, which implies,

$$||c_n\tilde{\psi}_n||^p_{X_0} - \mu|c_n\tilde{\psi}_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} - |c_n\tilde{\psi}_n|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} = 0,$$

where $c_n := g_n(v_n^-)$ and $\tilde{\psi}_n := u_n^+ + v_n^-$. Dividing by $c_n^{p^*}$ we have,

$$c_n^{p-p^*}||\tilde{\psi}_n||_{X_0}^p - \mu c_n^{q+1-p^*}|\tilde{\psi}_n|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} = |\tilde{\psi}_n|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}. \tag{2.54}$$

Note that $||\tilde{\psi}_n||_{X_0}$ is uniformly bounded above as $||u_n||_{X_0}$ is uniformly bounded and $\tilde{\rho}_n = o(1)$. Also, $||\tilde{\psi}_n||_{X_0} \geq ||u_n^+||_{X_0} - \tilde{\rho}_n||v||_{X_0}$. Note that $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \geq \tilde{b}$ for large n. If not, then $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. As $u_n \in N_{\mu,1}^-$, so $u_n^+ \in N_\mu^-$. Now, N_μ^- is a closed set and $0 \notin N_\mu^-$ and therefore $||u_n^-||_{X_0} \not\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus there exists $\tilde{b} \geq 0$ such that $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \geq \tilde{b} > 0$. This in turn implies that $||\tilde{\psi}_n||_{X_0} \geq C$, for some $C > 0$ by choosing $\tilde{\rho}_n$ small enough. Consequently, if c_n is not uniformly bounded, we obtain LHS of (2.54) converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$.

On the other hand,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_n|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \geq |u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} - \tilde{\rho}_n|v|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} > c,$$

for some positive constant c as $\rho_n = o(1)$ and $u_n^+ \in N_\mu^-$ implies

$$(p_s^* - 1 - q)|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} > (p - 1 - q)||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p > (p - 1 - q)\tilde{b}^p.$$

Hence, the claim follows.

Now using the fact that $g_n(0) = 1$ and the above claim we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}||_{X_0} &\leq ||u_n||_{X_0}\big|1 - g_n(v_n^-)\big| + \tilde{\rho}_n||\overline{v_n}||_{X_0}g_n(v_n^-) \\ &\leq ||u_n||_{X_0}\big[|\left\langle g_n'(0), v_n^-\right\rangle| + o(1)||\overline{v_n}||_{X_0}\big] + \tilde{\rho}_n||v||_{X_0}g_n(v_n^-) \\ &\leq \tilde{\rho}_n\big[||u_n||_{X_0}\left\langle g_n'(0), \overline{v_n}^+\right\rangle + o(1)||v||_{X_0} + ||v||_{X_0}g_n(v_n^-)\big] \\ &\leq \tilde{\rho}_n C. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this and (2.53) in (2.52) yields

$$\tilde{\rho}_n\Big(\left\langle g_n'(0), v^+\right\rangle + o(1)||v^+||_{X_0}\Big)\left\langle I_\mu'(u_n), v\right\rangle + \left\langle I_\mu'(u_n), v\right\rangle\tilde{\rho}_n + \tilde{\rho}_n o(1) \leq \tilde{\rho}_n.\frac{C}{n}.$$

This implies

$$\Big[\big(\left\langle g_n'(0), v^+\right\rangle + o(1)||v^+||_{X_0}\big) + 1\Big]\left\langle I_\mu'(u_n), v\right\rangle \leq \frac{C}{n} + o(1) \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Since $|\left\langle g_n'(0), v^+\right\rangle|$ is uniformly bounded (see Lemma 3.1 in Appendix) , letting $n \to \infty$ we have $I_\mu'(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$. Hence the step 4 follows.

Therefore $\{u_n\}$ is a (PS) sequence of I_μ at level $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$. From lemma 2.10, it follows that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- < \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{ps}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}} \quad \text{for} \quad \mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu}_1),$$

where $M = \frac{\big(pN-(N-ps)(q+1)\big)(p-1-q)}{p^2(q+1)}\big(\frac{(p-1-q)(N-ps)}{p^2 s}\big)^{\frac{q+1}{p_s^*-q-1}}|\Omega|$. Thus,

$$\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- < \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{ps}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the Lemma 2.9 that I_μ satisfies PS at level c for

$$c < \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{ps}} - M\mu^{\frac{p_s^*}{p_s^*-q-1}},$$

this yields, there exists $u \in X_0$ such that $u_n \to u$ in X_0. By doing a simple calculation we get $u_n^- \to u^-$ in X_0. Consequently, by Step 3 $||u^-||_{X_0} \geq b$. As $\mathcal{N}_{\mu,1}^-$ is a closed set

and $u_n \to u$, we obtain $u \in \mathcal{N}^-_{\mu,1}$, that is, $u^+ \in N^-_\mu$ and $u^+ \neq 0$. Therefore u is a solution of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ with u^+ and u^- are both nonzero. Hence, u is a sign-changing solution of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$. Define $\tilde{w}_1 := u$. This completes the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

Proof of part (ii) is similar to part (i) and we omit the proof. □

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ where β_1, β_2, $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ be defined as in (2.39) and (2.5) respectively. Then, there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, I_μ has a sign changing critical point in the following cases:*

(i) for $p \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, there exists $q_2 := \frac{Np}{N-sp} - \frac{p}{p-1}$ such that when $q > q_2$ and $N > sp(p^2-p+1)$,

(ii) for $2 \leq p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, there exists $q_3 := \frac{N(p-1)}{N-sp} - \frac{p-1}{p}$ such that when $q > q_3$ and $N > sp(p+1)$.

We need the following Proposition to prove the above Theorem 2.2.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume $0 < \mu < min\{\mu_*, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}_1\}$, where $\tilde{\mu}$ is as defined in (2.7) and $\mu_* > 0$ is chosen such that $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ is achieved in $(0, \mu_*)$ and $\tilde{\mu}_1$ is as in Lemma 2.10. Then, for $p \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, there exists $q_2 := \frac{Np}{N-sp} - \frac{p}{p-1}$ such that when $q > q_2$ and $N > sp(p^2-p+1)$ we have*

$$\sup_{a\geq 0,\ b\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) < \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu + \frac{s}{N} S^{\frac{N}{ps}},$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small , where w_1 is a positive solution of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ and u_ε be as in (2.20).

Furthermore, when $2 \leq p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, there exists $q_3 := \frac{N(p-1)}{N-sp} - \frac{p-1}{p}$ such that when $q > q_3$ and $N > sp(p+1)$, it holds

$$\sup_{a\geq 0,\ b\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) < \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu + \frac{s}{N} S^{\frac{N}{ps}},$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small .

To prove the above proposition, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.11. *Let w_1 and μ be as in Proposition 2.1. Then*

$$\sup_{s>0} I_\mu(sw_1) = \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu.$$

Proof. By the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$, we have $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu = \inf_{u\in N^-_\mu} I^+_\mu(u) = I^+_\mu(w_1) = I_\mu(w_1)$. In the last equality we have used the fact that $w_1 > 0$. Define $g(s) := I_\mu(sw_1)$. From the proof of Lemma 2.2, it follows that there exists only two critical points of g, namely $t^+(w_1)$ and $t^-(w_1)$ and $\max_{s>0} g(s) = g(t^+(w_1))$. On the other hand $\langle I'_\mu(w_1), v\rangle = 0$ for every $v \in X_0$. Therefore $g'(1) = 0$ which implies either $t^+(w_1) = 1$ or $t^-(w_1) = 1$.
Claim: $t^-(w_1) \neq 1$.
To see this, we note that $t^-(w_1) = 1$ implies $t^-(w_1)w_1 \in N^-_\mu$ as $w_1 \in N^-_\mu$. Using Lemma 2.2, we know $t^-(w_1)w_1 \in N^+_\mu$. Thus $N^+_\mu \cap N^-_\mu \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. Hence we have the claim.
Therefore $t^+(w_1) = 1$ and this completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let u_ε be as in (2.20) and μ be as in Proposition 2.1. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \frac{s}{N} S^{\frac{N}{ps}} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)}{(p-1)}} - k_8 |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Define $\tilde{\phi}(t) = \frac{t^p}{p}||u_\varepsilon||^p_{X_0} - \frac{t^{p_s^*}}{p_s^*}|u_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}$. Thus $I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \tilde{\phi}(t) - \mu\frac{t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$. On the other hand, applying the analysis done in Lemma 2.2 to u_ε, we obtain there exists $(t_0)_\varepsilon = \left(\frac{(p-1-q)||u_\varepsilon||^p_{X_0}}{(p_s^*-1-q)|u_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N-ps}{p^2s}} < t_\varepsilon^+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \sup_{t\geq 0} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = I_\mu(t_\varepsilon^+ u_\varepsilon) &= \tilde{\phi}(t_\varepsilon^+) - \mu\frac{(t_\varepsilon^+)^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \sup_{t\geq 0}\tilde{\phi}(t) - \mu\frac{(t_0)_\varepsilon^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the value of $(t_0)_\varepsilon$ and using Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\mu\frac{(t_0)_\varepsilon^{q+1}}{q+1} \geq \frac{\mu}{q+1}\left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-q-1}S\right)^{\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p^2s}} = k_8.$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) \leq \sup_{t\geq 0}\tilde{\phi}(t) - k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.55}$$

Using elementary analysis, it is easy to check that $\tilde{\phi}$ attains it's maximum at the point $\tilde{t}_0 = \left(\frac{||u_\varepsilon||^p_{X_0}}{|u_\varepsilon|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}}$ and $\tilde{\phi}(t_0) = \frac{s}{N}\left(\frac{||u_\varepsilon||^p_{X_0}}{|u_\varepsilon|^p_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N}{ps}}$.
Moreover, using (2.37) and (2.35), we can deduce as in (2.38) that

$$\tilde{\phi}(t_0) \leq \frac{s}{N}S^{\frac{N}{ps}} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)}{(p-1)}}. \tag{2.56}$$

Substituting back (2.56) into (2.55), completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 2.1: Note that, for fixed a and b, $I_\mu\big(\eta(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta})\big) \to -\infty$ as $|\eta| \to \infty$. Therefore $\sup_{a\geq 0,\ b\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ exists and supremum will be attained in $a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2$, for some large $R > 0$. Thus it is enough to estimate $I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta})$ in $\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} : a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2\}$. Using elementary inequality, there exists $d(m) > 0$ such that

$$|a+b|^m \geq |a|^m + |b|^m - d(|a|^{m-1}|b| + |a||b|^{m-1}) \quad \forall \quad a,\ b \in \mathbb{R},\ m > 1. \tag{2.57}$$

Define, $f(v) := ||v||^p_{X_0}$. Then using Taylor's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} f(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) &= f(aw_1) - \langle f'(aw_1), bu_\varepsilon\rangle + o(||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^2_{X_0}) \\ &\leq ||aw_1||^p_{X_0} \\ &- p\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|aw_1(x) - aw_1(y)|^{p-2}(aw_1(x) - aw_1(y))(bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\ &+ c||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^2_{X_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is small enough. We also note that from the definition of $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, it follows that $||u_{\varepsilon,\delta}||_{X_0}$ is bounded away from 0. Therefore, since $p \geq 2$ we have $c||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^2_{X_0} \leq ||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^p_{X_0}$,

for $c > 0$ small enough. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}||aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^p_{X_0} &= ||aw_1||^p_{X_0} \\ &- p\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|aw_1(x) - aw_1(y)|^{p-2}(aw_1(x) - aw_1(y))(bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\ &+ ||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^p_{X_0}\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) &\leq \frac{1}{p}||aw_1||^p_{X_0} \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|aw_1(x) - aw_1(y)|^{p-2}(aw_1(x) - aw_1(y))(bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}}dxdy \\ &+ \frac{1}{p}||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}||^p_{X_0} - \frac{1}{p^*_s}\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{p^*_s}dx - \frac{1}{p^*_s}\int_\Omega |bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p^*_s}dx \\ &- \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{q+1}dx - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{q+1}dx \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{p^*_s-1}|bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|dx + \int_\Omega |aw_1||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p^*_s-1}dx\right) \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{q}|bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|dx + \int_\Omega |aw_1||bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{q}dx\right) \\ &= I_\mu(aw_1) + I_\mu(bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) - a^q b\mu\int_\Omega |w_1|^{q-1}w_1u_{\varepsilon,\delta}dx \\ &- a^{p^*_s}b\int_\Omega |w_1|^{p^*_s-2}w_1u_{\varepsilon,\delta}dx \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |w_1|^{p^*_s-1}|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|dx + \int_\Omega |w_1||u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{p^*_s-1}dx\right) \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |w_1|^{q}|u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|dx + \int_\Omega |w_1||u_{\varepsilon,\delta}|^{q}dx\right).\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas 2.7, 2.11 and 2.12 we estimate in $a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2$,

$$I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \leq \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu + \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{ps}} - k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} + C\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)}{(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)q}{p(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N(p-1)+ps}{p(p-1)}}\right).$$

For the term $k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$, we invoke Lemma 2.8. Therefore when $\frac{N(p-2)+ps}{N-ps} < q < p-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) \leq \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu &+ \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{ps}} - k_9\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}} \\ &+ C\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)}{(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)q}{p(p-1)}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N(p-1)+ps}{p(p-1)}}\right) \qquad (2.58)\end{aligned}$$

We will choose q in such a way that the term $k_9\varepsilon^{N-\frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p}}$ dominates the other term involving ε. Note that among the terms in the bracket, $\varepsilon^{\frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)}}$ and $\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-ps)q}{p(p-1)}}$ dominate the others.

This in turn implies we have to choose q such that

$$N - \frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p} < \frac{N-ps}{p(p-1)} \qquad (2.59)$$

and

$$N - \frac{(N-ps)(q+1)}{p} < \frac{(N-ps)q}{p(p-1)}. \tag{2.60}$$

(2.59) and (2.60) implies $q > q_2$ and $q > q_3$ respectively, where

$$q_2 := \frac{Np}{N-sp} - \frac{p}{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q_3 := \frac{N(p-1)}{N-sp} - \frac{p-1}{p}. \tag{2.61}$$

Case 1: $p \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$
In this case by straight forward calculation it follows that $q_2 > q_3$. So in this case, we choose $q > q_2$. Moreover, since $q < p-1$, to make the interval $(q_2, p-1) \neq \emptyset$, we have to take $N > sp(p^2 - p + 1)$.

Case 2: $2 \leq p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$
In this case again by simple calculation it follows that $q_3 > q_2$. Thus, in this case, we choose $q > q_3$. Furthermore, as $q < p-1$, to make the interval $(q_3, p-1) \neq \emptyset$, we have to take $N > sp(p+1)$.

Hence in both the cases taking $\varepsilon > 0$ to be small enough in (2.58), we obtain

$$\sup_{a \geq 0, b \in \mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_{\varepsilon,\delta}) < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N} S_s^{\frac{N}{ps}}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2: Define $\mu_0 := \min\{\tilde{\mu}, \mu_*\}$,

$$\mathcal{N}_*^- := \mathcal{N}_{\mu,1}^- \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mu,2}^-. \tag{2.62}$$

and

$$c_2 := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_*^-} I_\mu(u), \tag{2.63}$$

Let $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$. Using Ekland's variational principle and similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we obtain a sequence $\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ satisfying

$$I_\mu(u_n) \to c_2, \quad I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad (X_0)'.$$

Thus $\{u_n\}$ is a (PS) sequence at level c_2. From Lemma 2.13, given below, it follows that there exists $a > 0$ and $b \in R$ such that $aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$. Therefore Proposition 2.1 yields

$$c_2 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N} S^{\frac{N}{ps}}. \tag{2.64}$$

Claim 1: There exists two positive constants c, C such that $0 < c \leq ||u_n^\pm||_{X_0} \leq C$.
To see this, we note that $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}_*^- \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mu,1}^-$. Thus using (2.43), Step 2 and Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have $||u_n^\pm||_{X_0} \leq C$ and $||u_n^-||_{X_0} \geq c$. To show $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \geq a$ for some $a > 0$, we use method of contradiction. Assume up to a subsequence $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. This together with Sobolev embedding implies $|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. On the other hand, $u_n^+ \in N_\mu^-$ implies $(p-1-q)||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p - (p_s^* - q - 1)|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} < 0$. Therefore by Sobolev inequality, we have

$$S \leq \frac{||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p}{|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^p} < \frac{p_s^* - q - 1}{p - 1 - q} |u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^* - p},$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that $|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. Hence the claim follows.

Going to a subsequence if necessary we have

$$u_n^+ \rightharpoonup \eta_1, \; u_n^- \rightharpoonup \eta_2 \quad \text{in} \quad X_0. \tag{2.65}$$

Claim 2: $\eta_1 \not\equiv 0,\ \eta_2 \not\equiv 0$.
Suppose not, that is $\eta_1 \equiv 0$. Then by compact embedding, $u_n^+ \to 0$ in $L^{q+1}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $u_n^+ \in N_\mu^- \subset N_\mu$, implies $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n^+), u_n^+ \right\rangle = 0$. Consequently,

$$||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p - |u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} = \mu |u_n^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} = o(1).$$

So we have $|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} = ||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p + o(1)$. This together with $||u_n^+||_{X_0} \geq c$ implies

$$\frac{|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}}{||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p} \geq 1 + o(1).$$

This along with Sobolev embedding gives $|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} \geq S^{N/ps} + o(1)$. Thus we have,

$$I_\mu(u_n^+) = \frac{1}{p}||u_n^+||_{X_0}^p - \frac{1}{p_s^*}|u_n^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} + o(1) \geq \frac{s}{N} S^{N/ps} + o(1). \tag{2.66}$$

Moreover, $u_n \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ implies $-u_n^- \in N_\mu^-$. Therefore using the given condition on β_2, we get

$$I_\mu(-u_n^-) \geq \beta_2 \geq \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-. \tag{2.67}$$

Also it follows $I_\mu(u_n^+) + I_\mu(-u_n^-) \leq I_\mu(u_n) = c_2 + o(1)$ (see (2.45)). Combining this along with (2.67) and (2.64), we obtain

$$I_\mu(u_n^+) \leq c_2 - \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + o(1) < \frac{s}{N} S_s^{N/ps},$$

which is a contradiction to (2.66). Therefore $\eta_1 \neq 0$. Similarly $\eta_2 \neq 0$ and this proves the claim.

Set $w_2 := \eta_1 - \eta_2$.
Claim 3: $w_2^+ = \eta_1$ and $w_2^- = \eta_2$ a.e..
To see the claim we observe that $\eta_1 \eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in Ω. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_\Omega \eta_1 \eta_2 dx| &= |\int_\Omega (u_n^+ - \eta_1) u_n^- dx + \int_\Omega \eta_1 (u_n^- - \eta_2) dx| \\ &\leq |u_n^+ - \eta_1|_{L^p(\Omega)} |u_n^-|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} + |\eta_1|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} |u_n^- - \eta_2|_{L^p(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{2.68}$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. By compact embedding we have $u_n^+ \to \eta_1$ and $u_n^- \to \eta_2$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. As $p \geq \frac{2N}{N+s}$, then $p' \leq p_s^*$. Therefore, using claim 1, we pass the limit in (2.68) and obtain $\int_\Omega \eta_1 \eta_2 dx = 0$. Moreover by (2.65), $\eta_1,\ \eta_2 \geq 0$ a.e.. Hence $\eta_1 \eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in Ω. We have $w_2^+ - w_2^- = w_2 = \eta_1 - \eta_2$. It is easy to check that $w_2^+ \leq \eta_1$ and $w_2^- \leq \eta_2$. To show that equality holds a.e. we apply method of contradiction. Suppose, there exists $E \subset \Omega$ such that $|E| > 0$ and $0 \leq w_2^+(x) < \eta_1(x)\ \forall\ x \in E$. Therefore $\eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in E by the observation that we made. Hence $w_2^+(x) - w_2^-(x) = \eta_1(x)$ a.e. in E. Clearly $w_2^-(x) \not> 0$ a.e., otherwise $w_2^+(x) = 0$ a.e. and that would imply $\eta_1(x) = -w_2^-(x) < 0$ a.e, which is not possible since $\eta_1 > 0$ in E. Thus $w_2^-(x) = 0$. Hence $\eta_1(x) = w_2^+(x)$ a.e. in E, which is a contradiction. Hence the claim follows.

Therefore w_2 is sign changing in Ω and $u_n \rightharpoonup w_2$ in X_0. Moreover, $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u_n(x) - u_n(y)|^{p-2}(u_n(x) - u_n(y))(\phi(x) - \phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+ps}} dxdy \qquad & -\mu \int_\Omega |u_n|^{q-1} u_n \phi dx \\ & - \int_\Omega |u_n|^{p_s^* - 2} u_n \phi dx = o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{2.69}$$

for every $\phi \in X_0$. Passing the limit using Vitali's convergence theorem via Hölder's inequality we obtain $\langle I'_\mu(w_2), \phi\rangle = 0$. Hence w_2 is a sign changing weak solution to $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$. □

Lemma 2.13. *Let $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ be as defined in* (2.20) *and w_1 be a positive solution of $(\mathcal{P}_\mu)$ for which $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ is achieved, when $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$. Then there exists $a,\ b \in \mathbb{R},\ a \geq 0$ such that $aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}^-_*$, where $\mathcal{N}^-_*$ is defined as in* (2.62).

This lemma can be proved in the spirit of [5, Lemma 4.8], for the convenience of the reader we again sketch the proof in the appendix.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Define $\mu^* = \min\{\mu_*, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}_1, \mu_0, \mu_1\}$, where μ_* is chosen such that $\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu$ is achieved in $(0, \mu_*)$. $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\mu}_1$, μ_0 and μ_1 are as in (2.7), Lemma 2.10, Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 3.1 respectively. Furthermore, define q_0 and N_0 as follows:

$$q_0 := \begin{cases} \max\{q_1, q_2\} & \text{when} \quad p \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}, \\ \max\{q_1, q_3\} & \text{when} \quad 2 \leq p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

$$N_0 := \begin{cases} sp(p^2 - p + 1) & \text{when} \quad p \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}, \\ sp(p+1) & \text{when} \quad 2 \leq p < \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $N_0 > \frac{sp}{2}[p + 1 + \sqrt{(p+1)^2 - 4}]$, where the RHS appeared in Theorem 2.1. Hence combining Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, we complete the proof of this theorem for $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, $q > q_0$ and $N > N_0$. □

3. Appendix

Lemma 3.1. *Let g_n be as in* (2.47) *in the Theorem 2.1 and $v \in X_0$ such that $||v||_{X_0} = 1$. Then there exists $\mu_1 > 0$ such that if $\mu \in (0, \mu_1)$ implies $\langle g'_n(0), v^+\rangle$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.*

Proof. In view of lemma 2.5 we have,

$$\langle g'_n(0), v^+\rangle = \frac{pA(u_n, v^+) - p^*_s \displaystyle\int_\Omega |u_n|^{p^*_s - p} u_n v^+ - (q+1)\mu \int_\Omega |u_n|^{q-1} u_n v^+}{(p-1-q)||u_n||^p_{X_0} - (p^*_s - q - 1)|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)}}.$$

Using Claim 2 in theorem 2.1, there exists $C > 0$ such that $||u_n||_{X_0} \leq C$ for all $n \geq 1$. Therefore applying Hölder inequality followed by Sobolev inequality, we have $|\langle g'_n(0), v^+\rangle| \leq \frac{C||v||_{X_0}}{\left|(p-1-q)||u_n||^p_{X_0} - (p^*_s - q - 1)|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)}\right|}$. Hence it is enough to show

$$\left|(p-1-q)||u_n||^p_{X_0} - (p^*_s - q - 1)|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)}\right| > C,$$

for some $C > 0$ and n large. Suppose it does not hold. Then up to a subsequence

$$(p-1-q)||u_n||^p_{X_0} - (p^*_s - q - 1)|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)} = o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence,

$$||u_n||^p_{X_0} = \frac{p^* - q - 1}{p - 1 - q}|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)} + o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Combining the above expression along with the fact that $u_n \in N_\mu$, we obtain

$$\mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = \frac{p^*_s - p}{p - 1 - q}\,|u_n|^{p^*_s}_{L^{p^*_s}(\Omega)} + o(1) = \frac{p^*_s - p}{p^*_s - 1 - q}||u_n||^p_{X_0} + o(1). \tag{3.2}$$

After applying Hölder inequality and followed by Sobolev inequality, expression (3.2) yields

$$||u_n||_{X_0} \leq \left(\mu\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*-p}|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}S^{-\frac{q+1}{p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1-q}} + o(1). \tag{3.3}$$

Combining (2.43) and Claim 3 in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have $||u_n||_{X_0} \geq b$, for some $b > 0$. Therefore from (3.1) we get

$$|u_n|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \geq C \quad \text{for some constant } C > 0, \text{ and } n \text{ large enough.} \tag{3.4}$$

Define $\psi_\mu : N_\mu \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\psi_\mu(u) = k_0\left(\frac{||u||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} - \mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)},$$

where $k_0 = \left(\frac{p-1-q}{p_s^*-q-1}\right)^{\frac{p_s^*-1}{p_s^*-p}}\left(\frac{p_s^*-p}{p-1-q}\right)$. Simplifying $\psi_\mu(u_n)$ using (3.2), we obtain

$$\psi_\mu(u_n) = k_0\left[\left(\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p-1-q}\right)^{p_s^*-1}\frac{|u_n|^{(p_s^*-1)p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right]^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} - \frac{p_s^*-p}{p-1-q}|u_n|^{p_s^*}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} + o(1) = o(1). \tag{3.5}$$

On the other hand, using Hölder inequality in the definition of $\psi_\mu(u_n)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_\mu(u_n) &= k_0\left(\frac{||u_n||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} - \mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\
&\geq k_0\left(\frac{||u_n||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \\
&= |u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}\left\{k_0\left(\frac{||u_n||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Using Sobolev embedding and (3.3), we simplify the term $\left(\frac{||u_n||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{||u_n||^{p(p_s^*-1)}_{X_0}}{|u_n|^{p_s^*(p-1)}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}} &\geq S^{\frac{p_s^*-1}{p_s^*-p}}|u_n|^{-q}_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \\
&\geq S^{\frac{p_s^*-1}{p_s^*-p}+\frac{q}{p}}||u_n||^{-q}_{X_0} \\
&\geq S^{\frac{p_s^*-1}{p_s^*-p}+\frac{q}{p}}\left(\mu\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*-p}|\Omega|^{\frac{p^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}S^{-\frac{q+1}{p}}\right)^{-\frac{q}{p-1-q}}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Substituting back (3.7) into (3.6) and using (3.4), we obtain

$$\psi_\mu(u_n) \geq C^{q+1}\left[k_0 S^{\frac{p_s^*-1}{p_s^*-p}+\frac{q}{p-1-q}}\mu^{-\frac{q}{p-1-q}}\left(\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*-p}|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}\right)^{-\frac{q}{p-1-q}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{p_s^*-q-1}{p_s^*}}\right] \geq d_0,$$

for some $d_0 > 0$, n large and $\mu < \mu_1$, where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(k_0, s, q, N, |\Omega|)$. This is a contradiction to (3.5). Hence the lemma follows. □

Proof of Lemma 2.13

Proof. We will show that there exists $a > 0,\ b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^+ \in N_\mu^- \quad \text{and} \quad -a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^- \in N_\mu^-.$$

Let us denote $\bar{r}_1 = \inf_{x\in\Omega} \frac{w_1(x)}{u_\varepsilon(x)},\ \bar{r}_2 = \sup_{x\in\Omega} \frac{w_1(x)}{u_\varepsilon(x)}$.
As both w_1 and u_ε are positive in Ω, we have $\bar{r}_1 \geq 0$ and $\bar{r}_2$ can be $+\infty$. Let $r \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$. Then $w_1, u_\varepsilon \in X_0$ implies $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon) \in X_0$ and $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \equiv 0$ would imply $\bar{r}_2 \leq r$, which is not possible. Define $v_r := w_1 - ru_\varepsilon$. Hence $0 \not\equiv v_r^+ \in X_0$ (since for any $u \in X_0$, we have $|u| \in X_0$. Similarly $0 \not\equiv v_r^- \in X_0$. Therefore by lemma 2.2 there exists $0 < s^+(r) < s^-(r)$ such that $s^+(r)v_r^+ \in N_\mu^-$, and $-s^-(r)(v_r^-) \in N_\mu^-$. Let us consider the functions $s^\pm : \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$ defined as above.
Claim: The functions $r \mapsto s^\pm(r)$ are continuous and

$$\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_1^+} s^+(r) = t^+(v_{\bar{r}_1}^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} s^+(r) = +\infty,$$

where the function t^+ is same as defined in lemma 2.2.
To see the claim, choose $r_0 \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ and $\{r_n\}_{n\geq 1} \subset (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ such that $r_n \to r_0$ as $n \to \infty$. We need to show that $s^+(r_n) \to s^+(r_0)$ as $n \to \infty$. Corresponding to r_n and r_0, we have $v_{r_n}^+ = (w_1 - r_n u_\varepsilon)^+$ and $v_{r_0}^+ = (w_1 - r_0 u_\varepsilon)^+$. By lemma 2.2. we note that $s^+(r) = t^+(v_r^+)$. Let us define the function

$$\begin{aligned} F(s,r) &:= s^{p-1-q}||(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+||_{X_0}^p - s^{p_s^*-q-1}|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*} - \mu|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1} \\ &= \phi(s,r) - \mu|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}^{q+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi(s,r) := s^{p-1-q}||(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+||_{X_0}^p - s^{p_s^*-q-1}|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}.$$

Doing the similar calculation as in lemma 2.2, we obtain that for any fixed r, the function $F(s,r)$ has only two zeros $s = t^+(v_r^+)$ and $s = t^-(v_r^+)$. Consequently $s^+(r)$ is the largest 0 of $F(s,r)$ for any fixed r. As $r_n \to r_0$ we have $v_{r_n}^+ \to v_{r_0}^+$ in X_0 . Indeed, by straight forward computation it follows $v_{r_n} \to v_{r_0}$ in X_0. Therefore $|v_{r_n}| \to |v_{r_0}|$ in X_0. This in turn implies $v_{r_n}^+ \to v_{r_0}^+$ in X_0. Hence $||v_{r_n}^+||_{X_0} \to ||v_{r_0}^+||_{X_0}$. Moreover by Sobolev inequality, we have $|v_{r_n}^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \to |v_{r_0}^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}$ and $|v_{r_n}^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \to |v_{r_0}^+|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$. As a result, we have $F(s,r_n) \to F(s,r_0)$ uniformly. Therefore an elementary analysis yields $s^+(r_n) \to s^+(r_0)$.

Moreover, $\bar{r}_2 \geq \frac{w_1}{u_\varepsilon}$ implies $w_1 - \bar{r}_2 u_\varepsilon \leq 0$. As a consequence $r \to \bar{r}_2^-$ implies $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \to 0$ pointwise. Moreover, since $|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq |w_1|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, using dominated convergence theorem we have $|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. From the analysis in Lemma 2.2, for any r, we also have $s^+(r) > t_0(v_r^+)$, where function t_0 is defined as in lemma 2.2, which is the maximum point of $\phi(.,r)$. Therefore it is enough to show that $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} t_0(v_r^+) = \infty$. Applying Sobolev inequality in the definition of $t_0(v_r^+)$ we get

$$t_0(v_r^+) = \left(\frac{(p-1-q)||v_r^+||_{X_0}^p}{(p_s^*-1-q)|v_r^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{p_s^*}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} \geq \left(\frac{S(p-1-q)}{p_s^*-1-q}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_s^*-p}} |v_r^+|_{L^{p_s^*}(\Omega)}^{-1}.$$

Hence $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} t_0(v_r^+) = \infty$.

Proceeding similarly we can show that if $r \to \bar{r}_1^-$ then $v_r^+ \to v_{\bar{r}_1}$ and $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_1^+} s^+(r) = t^+(v_{\bar{r}_1}^+)$ and

$$\lim_{r\to r_1^+} s^-(r) = +\infty,\ \lim_{r\to r_2^-} s^-(r) = t^+(v_r^-) < +\infty.$$

The continuity of $s^{\pm}$ implies that there exists $b \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ such that $s^+(r) = s^-(r) = a > 0$. Therefore,

$$a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^+ \in N_\mu^- \quad \text{and} \quad -a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^- \in N_\mu^-,$$

that is, the function $a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ and this completes the proof.

□

Acknowledgement: The first author is supported by the INSPIRE research grant DST/INSPIRE 04/2013/000152 and the second author is supported by the NBHM grant 2/39(12)/2014/RD-II.

References

[1] Ambrosetti, A.; Azorero, G. J.; Peral, I, Multiplicity results for some nonlinear elliptic equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* 137 (1996) 219-242.

[2] Ambrosetti, A.; Brezis, H; Cerami, G., Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems. *J. Funct. Analysis* 122 (1994), 519–543.

[3] Barrios, B.; Colorado, E., Servadei, R.; Soria, F., A critical fractional equation with concave-convex power nonlinearities. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 32 (2015), no. 4, 875-900.

[4] Bartsch, T.; Willem, M., On an elliptic equation with concave and convex nonlinearities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 123 (1995), no. 11, 3555-3561.

[5] Bhakta, M.; Mukherjee, D. Multiplicity results and sign changing solutions of non-local equations with concave-convex nonlinearities. *Differential and Integral Equations*,Vol. 30, No. 5-6, 2017.

[6] Brandle, C.; Colorado, E.; Pablo, A.; Sánchez, U., A concave-convex elliptic problem involving the fractional Laplacian. *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb. A* 143 (2013)39-71.

[7] Brasco, L.; Franzina, G., Convexity properties of Dirichlet integrals and Picone-type inequalities. *Kodai Math. J.* 37 (2014), no. 3, 769-799.

[8] Brasco, L.; Lindgren, E.; Parini, E., The fractional Cheeger problem.*Interfaces Free Bound.* 16 (2014), no. 3, 419-458.

[9] Brasco. L; Mosconi. S; Squassina. M, Optimal decay of extremal functions for the fractional Sobolev inequality, *Calculus Var. Partial Differential Equations* 55 (2016), 1-32.

[10] Charro, F.; Colorado, E.; Peral, I., Multiplicity of solutions to uniformly elliptic fully nonlinear equations with concave-convex right-hand side. *J. Diff. Eqns* 246 (2009), 4221-4248.

[11] Chen, J., Some further results on a semilinear equation with concave-convex nonlinearity. *Nonlinear Anal.* 62 (2005), no. 1, 71-87

[12] Chen, W.; Deng, S., The Nehari manifold for non-local elliptic operators involving concave-convex nonlinearities. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.* 66 (2015), no. 4, 1387-1400.

[13] Chen, W.; Squassina, M., Nonlocal systems with critical concave-convex powers *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* 16 (2016), 821–842.

[14] Di Nezza E.; Palatucci, G.; Valdinoci, E., Hitchhikers guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 136, 521-573 (2012).

[15] Drábek, P.; Pohozaev, S,, Positive solutions for the p-Laplacian: application of the fibering method.*Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect.* A 127 (1997), no. 4, 703–726.

[16] Goyal, S.; Sreenadh, K., Nehari manifold for non-local elliptic operator with concave-convex non-linearities and signchanging weight function, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.* 125 (2015), 545–558.

[17] Goyal, S.; Sreenadh, K., Existence of multiple solutions of p-fractional Laplace operator with sign-changing weight function *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* 4 (2015), 37-58.

[18] Iannizzotto, A; Liu, S.; Perera, K.; Squassina, M. Existence results for fractional p-Laplacian problems via Morse theory, *Adv. Calc. Var.* 9 (2016), 101–125.

[19] Lindgren, E.; Lindqvist, P. Fractional eigenvalues, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 49 (2014), 795–826.

[20] Mosconi S.; Perera K.; ,Squassina M.;Yang Y.,The Brezis-Nirenberg problem for the fractional p-Laplacian *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 55 (2016), no. 4, Paper No. 105, 25 pp.

[21] Perera, K; Squassina, M; Yang, Y, Bifurcation results for critical growth fractional p-Laplacian problems, *Math. Nachr.* 289 (2016), 332-342.

[22] Servadei, R.; Valdinoci, E., Mountain Pass solutions for non-local elliptic operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 389 (2012), 887–898.

[23] Servadei, R.; Valdinoci, E., The Brezis-Nirenberg result for the fractional Laplacian. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 367 (2015), no. 1, 67–102.
[24] Tang, M., Exact multiplicity for semilinear elliptic Dirichlet problems involving concave and convex nonlinearities, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 133 (2003) 705-717.

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Dr. Homi Bhaba Road, Pune-411008, India
E-mail address: M. Bhakta: mousomi@iiserpune.ac.in, D. Mukherjee: debangana18@gmail.com